Subject: YAREMKO Ivan of Chicago, Ill.

Date : 15 Feb 1966

Source :

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIBENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B HAZIWAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2007

74-124-29/3

- 1. On 29 Jan 1966 S.bject visited Source together with ZYBLIKIEWICZ Eugen of Philadelphia, Pa. Both were supposed to arrive at Source's house around 13.00hrs but Subject than his friend. They stayed at Source's house until 18.00 hrs.
- 2. Subject confirmed again that DZIUBA'S speech he had got from his female friend in Lviv and gave her name (O.K.). Fyldantly, this was only one of many documents of its kind widely circulated now in Ukraine in handwriting and types. Subject, however, took only this one. While in Kiev he had asked PIDSUKHA whether really there was a speech made by DZIUBA in Jan 1965 at the Union Of Writers of Ukraine, and PIDSUKHA confirmed it. In Source's opinion, KOLOSSOVA should have known about Subject having the speech in his pocket and therefore she saw him to the airport to get him through at the customs without any trouble. On other occasion he was talking about KOLOSSOVA helping him out at the customs as though she definitely had known about Subject's possession of the speech.
- 3. A lot of time Subject devoted to the problem of re-visit of Dr Kl and others to Kiev in 1966. In his opinion their re-visit was mandatory and Dr Kl would make a profound mistake by "missing this opportunity". According to Subject it was KOLOSSOVA who had made clear to him that any withdrawal of Dr Kl and others from an active cultural exchange and leaving of all the initiative to the other side was beneficial to those in Kiev and Moscow who were for a comlete isolation of people in the Ukraine from emigration and for an overall russification. In brief, by not going to Ukraine in 1966 Dr Kl and others were going to help the Russificators and to harm genuine Ukrainian patriots.

Subject stressed also that Dr Kl must have that in case she would protract her visit to Ukraime and the whole business with cultural exchange in general, "they" (in Kiev) would definitely resign from her and find someone else. All depended now on Dr Kl whose position at the present was evidently

STORT .

very influential and highly esteemed in Kiev and therefore she should start with preparations immediately. Even here, abroad, very much depended on Dr El. Thus , Dr LAPICHAK Toma of Chicago had assered Subject that he would go to Ukraine provided Dr Kl would go too.

The re-visit to Kiew should be arranged as follows: there would be two categories of visitors. The first one would consist of Dr Kl, Dr LAPICHAK, Prof PELENSKY Yaroslav, KUKURUDZA, STAKHIV, BILYNSKY Iko (Andrei) of Munich and a few more of those who would conduct negotiations with high Soviet personalities in both, Kiev and Moscow. The second group would include various professionals who would visit places of their interest, like for instance, engineers would go to Zaporizia and other industrial centers, doctors should visit famous medical centers, artists would meet with artists, and simple tourists would do just sightseeing. Subject thought that a group of 50 people or so would be just ideal.

Subject himself would not be involved in political negotiations, he preferred to limit his role to technical organization of the visit itself.

4. As an additional argument in favor of the visit to Kiev Subject mentioned numerous contacts he had made in the Ukraine which should serve as genuine sources of information for the group abroad. On this occasion he indicated that in many cases emigration was deprived of actual information about what was going on in the Ukraine and often fell victim to rumors and disinformation.

Thus, prior to his last trip to Kiev Subject was told about lawyers' case and while in the Ukraine tried to find out something more about it. Some people in Lviv told him about the case too but in such a vague and general way that he finally bacame convinced that it had probably been just a heax. At the present there are talks about arrests of young Ukrainians in Lviv and Kiev but he personally does not believe it and thinks of them as of just another rumor. But - he added - if we would properly develop contacts I have access to, in the Ukraine, we were in possession of precise information on which to base our political moves.

- 5. According to Subject the visiting group could include even %officers of the SS Division Galisia but no one who played a leading role
 in organizing the division itself.
- 6. According to Subject , KOLOSSOVA was a genuine Ukrainian patriot and she had warned him that MOSCOW became frightened by her first moves along Ukrainian emigration in 1964-1965 and wanted km now to foill her efforts to strengthen contacts with Ukrainians abroad.

 KOLOSSOVA should have stressed to Subject that people like herself were in great need of emigration's help and those who were against the visit to Kiev were simply playing to Moscow's tune.
- 7. In Subject's opinion politics as such should be excluded from group's activities and that's why no political leader should be tracked in the revisiting body. On this occasion he also mentioned "Prolog2 as the institution "to be avoided by all means". Because Mr M.L. was definitely more interested in intelligence than in anything else and probably would put American interests ahead of "Ukrainian cause", in any case.
- 8. In the near future, maybe even in a fortnight or so Subject will move to Philadelphia, Pa and start his business anew. Among other things he plans to produce some records of songs received from Ukraine, take some impressario functions for gristic groups from Ukraine, aso.
- 9. Subject mentioned again a student of Toronto who last year came after two year stay from Ukraine and suggested that it would be probably a good idea to get him here to New York, N.Y. He is the same one who was taken from all the materials by the KGB on his departure from Kiev. (N.B. Subject referred to Kolaska Ivan).